HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIII, No. 45 November 10, 1956 Washington, D. C.

News Section

What Happened in the Election — Presidency: Ike won, not because of some irresistible spell of personality, but because he bested Adlai by sheer political ability in the last four weeks of the campaign. This is the way some of the best minds in this political city figure it.

Late in September, the odds in favor of a Stevenson victory seemed to be mounting. David Lawrence, a columnist well known for his partiality for Ike, wrote, on September 28: "If Ike wins this campaign, it will be by a close vote. If he loses, it may be that the Democratic tide will be of 'landslide proportions'."

On October 3, Samuel Lubell, a shrewd analyst of voting trends, noted that Ike was "losing votes from 1952" and raised the question: "Can this drift back to the Democrats be built into an irresistible tide which will sweep along all those now 'undecided'?"

On the same day the Scripps-Howard *Washington Daily News*, a backer of Ike, stated that "as of today the Democrats appear to many dopesters to be ahead in the race for the Presidency." Ike and the GOP were in trouble.

At that time, Stevenson's developing campaign to limit tests of the H-Bomb ran afoul of the temper of the American people. Ike adeptly handled the Adlai attack by restating his official policy of continuing such tests as long as they were necessary. In the face of this Democratic proposal to appease a foreign nation, Ike exploited the nationalistic sentiment of the American people.

Then came the Bulganin letter, which accentuated the un-American posture of the Democratic candidate, and Ike ably underlined the contrast between this posture and his own.

Thus an internationalist President outmaneuvered his adversary by tapping the latent nationalism of the people. (He did much the same thing in '52, obtaining his majority in large part by appealing to two elements profoundly nationalistic — the followers of Senator McCarthy and many Southerners.)

Finally, by the end of the month, the rising Middle East crisis, carrying the threat of World War III, put the challenge to the American voter: which candidate? The great majority of voters by this time had become so exasperated with Adlai's wild swinging that the verdict was not in doubt. It was — "Don't change horses in mid-stream."

What Happened in the Election — Congress: Politicos in Washington talk of little beside the startling fact that for the first election in 108 years a President failed to carry with him both Houses of Congress. (The last time that occurred, a general — Zachary Taylor — won, but died 15 months after his inauguration.)

Since that time, Presidents of various parties, even when getting only 51, 52 and 53 per cent of the popular vote, have always carried Congress. In recent history, election of GOP Presidents resulted in great Republican victories in Congressional elections.

Thus, in 1920, when Harding swept the Democrats out of office by taking 62 per cent of the popular vote (Ike in this election got 58 per cent), the GOP captured 303 House seats (the Democrats got only 131). In 1924, when Coolidge took 65 per cent of the major party vote, the Republicans elected 247 House members against 183 for the Democrats. In 1928, when Hoover fell just short of taking 60 per cent of the popular vote, the Republicans elected 267 Congressmen to 167 for the Democrats. In those three Presidential years, the Republicans came out of the election with 59, 56 and 56 Senators respectively.

In the Capital, GOP party leaders — often *sotto voce* — survey such figures and ask: "What's the matter with Ike's 'modern Republicanism'?" They adduce the following observations to explain why Ike wins and the party loses Congress.

The late Senator Taft, several weeks after the Ike victory in 1952, was asked how he thought he would have fared if he had been the GOP candidate. He reportedly said: "I might not have won by as big a popular majority as General Eisenhower, but I would have carried more Republican members of the House and Senate with me." He obviously meant that he would have made it a Republican party campaign rather than a personal popularity campaign.

Copyright 1956 by Human Events, Inc.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the past few days it was remarked that "a visitor from Mars would never know from listening to Eisenhower's speech broadcasts that Ike was the nominee of the Republican party." The fact is that from Ike's first campaign speech to his Election eve message, the printed texts show almost no mention of the Republican party. Even when he asked for the election of Republican Senators, the President usually omitted mentioning their party affiliation. Apparently the avoidance of the word "Republican" was deliberate.

Why this extraordinary practice? The most credible explanation offered by observers is that the personnel of the White House Palace Guard, in their determination to modernize the GOP, want their own status strengthened. They seek to do this by emphasizing that Ike (whose name they use in a collective sense for the entire Executive branch, to include themselves) is of supreme importance, and the party, in the states and in Congress, is of minor importance.

This is why the election evening telecast of the Republicans, with millions watching, did not mention a single Republican except Eisenhower and Nixon. The White House directors deliberately omitted throwing the spotlight on members of the House or Senate or on gubernatorial candidates.

It is recalled by politicos that — in contrast — Roosevelt and Truman never failed to promote and build up the Democratic party, often using "this great Democratic rally" (Ike's phrase under similar circumstances: "This great rally"). The Democratic policy has built up a big backlog of popularity which results in such Congressional election outcomes as that of last Tuesday.

Tuesday's results show the Democrats holding about 230 House seats to around 200 for the Republicans (several seats in doubt at this writing) and 49 seats in the Senate as against 47 GOP seats. Ten years ago, in the 1946 (80th) Congress, the GOP took the Senate by a margin of 51 to 45. In the House, it won a margin over the Democrats of 57 seats. In a decade, therefore (observers point out), "liberal" Republicanism has changed a substantial GOP majority into a commanding lead for the Democrats.

Mandate for 'Modern Republicanism'? Remarks made too hastily by the President as returns came in on election night suggested that the outcome should be regarded as a mandate for a "modern Republican" party — that is, for a "liberal," pro-labor, internationalist party. It may be that he would have modified this judgment as final reports from the Congressional races came in.

For the Congressional outcome shows scant evidence that the President has made any significant progress in carrying into office Congressional candidates committed to "liberal Republicanism." Out of three incumbent GOP Senators who were defeated, two were strong for "liberalism," one was a conservative, Taft Republican. One of the "liberals" was Senator Duff of Pennsylvania, who was in the forefront of the early Republicans for Eisenhower and an antagonist of the conservative wing of his party. The other "liberal," former Taft-man George Bender, turned a flip-flop under Eisenhower and became a fervid "liberal," ending up with organized labor support in his campaign for re-election. The conservative who was beaten was Welker of Idaho; his Democratic opponent drew well-heeled support from New York "liberal" sources.

Javits, described by Ike as a good example of "modern Republicanism," ran over one million votes behind Candidate Eisenhower.

Finally, the sweep brought back into the Senate one of the outstanding constitutional conservatives of the last 20 years — Senator Chapman Revercomb of West Virginia. By "liberals" he is rated as far more "reactionary" than any other Republican. According to tabulations including most West Virginia precincts, Revercomb took almost exactly the same proportion of votes for his office — approximately 54 per cent — as did Eisenhower. (Later returns, not yet official, indicate that Revercomb's percentage will exceed Eisenhower's.)

As for the leadership, opinion here is virtually unanimous that conservative leaders Knowland and Bridges will become even more outspoken and independent in their policies and in their relations with the White House. Whether the President of the Senate, Nixon, will follow suit is a matter of much debate. At any rate, nothing in the campaign results supports the charges of Nixon's adversary, Harold Stassen, that Nixon would prove a drag on the re-election of the top of the ticket. Since Nixon derives his support mainly from the conservative element of the party, and Stassen was sponsored by the GOP's "liberals," conservatives take comfort in this alignment.

Lausche: The figure of the new Senator-elect from Ohio looms not only as highly important in the reconstruction of the defeated Democratic party, but also as critically important to the organization of the Senate, if the margin of control is too thin in that body.

Discussion of the latter subject in Washington today recalls the suggestion Lausche made during his Senatorial campaign — that he might, depend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing on circumstances, vote with the Republicans to organize the Senate. The Republicans, it is remarked here, may too easily rely on this statement, if reports from Ohio's capital are true. These reports say that Governor Lausche is very indignant at Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey for the latter's action during the campaign, soliciting funds for Senator George Bender, Lausche's opponent. Reporters say they heard Lausche comment: "If a tax commissioner in Ohio had done that, he would have been fired on the spot." Republican Senators privately conceded that Humphrey's action was inexcusable and that they have been hard put to it to defend him under attack by Democrats in the Senate.

Whatever happens, Lausche is in a good position to demand a thorough investigation of Mr. Humphrey's conduct by the Senate Elections Committee. While Lausche is classified as a conservative, it is well known that he glories in his independence of both parties and that he likes Big Business no better than he does Big Labor.

Electoral College Reform: Students of political science in the nation's capital, seeking to discover a pattern in the confusing welter of statistics, come up with the following conclusion: electoral college reform emerges as the hope of the conservative forces.

The relation of the present U.S. political situation to the electoral college is not always widely understood. Briefly put, today, under the present method, the winner in each state (even though by only a few hundred votes) gets the entire electoral vote of that state. As a result, the big-city states are vital to Presidential victory, so the party strategists aim their appeals to the minority blocs whose membership tends to vote solidly for the party which promises fulfillment of their exclusive interest.

The proposed reforms of the electoral college would proportion the electoral vote exactly according to the vote in the electoral unit. (Each state would be the unit, under the Kefauver-Daniel formula. Each congressional district would be the unit, under the Mundt-Coudert formula). The natural conservatism of the American people, it is argued by political scientists, will be able to express itself when one or the other of the two proposed amendments is adopted. It is reported that electoral reform stands a good chance of favorable action in the coming session of Congress.

States' Rights Vote: Observers here believe that Tuesday's vote for States' Rights candidates (T. Coleman Andrews and Senator Harry Byrd), at a time when many conservatives were voting for Ike because they feared Stevenson, should put some brakes on the leftward plunge of both major parties. Incomplete totals show that well over a quarter of a million votes were cast for the States' Rights candidates. Most of them were in six states — Louisiana, Virginia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama, and Tennessee. In the first three of these states over 40,000 ballots were cast for States' Rights while Eisenhower was winning. In South Carolina, Senator Byrd outran Eisenhower, pulling about 90,000 votes.

According to the Associated Press, even these figures do not tell the full strength of the movement, because "in many counties of the several states where the Andrews ticket was entered, election officials did not bother to report votes except for the two major parties." The final result, therefore, will not be in until late December.

States' Righters point to Tennessee as an example of the power their ticket can wield in 1960 — on the ballot in all states and with four years of preparation under its belt. The Andrews vote in the Volunteer State, had it gone to either major candidate, would have meant the margin of certain victory. Do this on a nationwide basis, say the States' Righters, while winning some of the states that gave the Third Party its heaviest vote this time, and an impasse in the electoral college will result, throwing the election into the House.

Defeat Of An Egghead: One highly important reason for Adlai's appallingly bad showing can be traced to his "egghead" political stupidity — say political students here in the Capital. What they mean is that the eggheads — the ADA intellectuals, the New and Fair Dealers, etc. — habitually carry their socialistic fanaticism and doctrinaire "liberalism" to such lengths that this produces a reaction against their candidates at the polls — much to the chagrin of the ordinary Democratic machine politicos who want to play the game quite otherwise.

In 1954, for instance, the Democrats might well have taken at least two more precious Senate seats, if it had not been for Fair Deal fanaticism against Senator McCarthy. In both New Jersey and Ohio, ordinary Democratic politicos counselled avoidance of any stand on the inflammatory McCarthy issue, leaving that to divide the Republicans. In Ohio, Democratic Senator Burke, however, yielded to the advice of fanatical New Dealer Michael di Salle and publicly promised to vote for the censure of the Wisconsin Senator. Until then a sure winner, he lost votes in large numbers and was defeated. He had dug his grave by yielding to left-wing fanaticism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This year, history may record that Adlai prepared his own interment by his radical position on H-Bomb tests. Following the egghead prescription — to get votes, turn farther and farther left — Stevenson adopted the Oppenheimer-like position that hydrogen bomb tests must be suspended even without an agreement to do the same by the Soviet Union. Few observers will disagree that this was too much for the average voter.

Conservative Victories: In two important referendums Tuesday, voters vetoed important "liberal" measures. In Nevada, a proposal to repeal the state's "right to work" law was defeated by a safe margin; while, in New York, "Proposition 2" — to authorize a $100 million bond issue to float loans for a middle-income public housing program — was beaten by over 200,000 votes.

Labor Politicking: Almost as morgue-like as the Democratic National Committee's hotel suite, site for its anticipated "victory celebration," as returns rolled in Election night showing Stevenson bowing in inglorious defeat, was the headquarters of the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education — COPE.

Its leaders were stunned and unbelieving; they could hardly comprehend that the Presidential ticket for which they had toiled so assiduously and so diligently was taking such a beating. They found solace in some local and Congressional races in which their candidates were running surprisingly strong, but in the main go they were licked—badly.

Even in the secondary races, their score was not too enviable. Their assistance was of material help in winning an unprecedented fifth term for Michigan's Gov. G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams; in defeating Herman Welker in Idaho and Douglas McKay in Oregon; and in many other spots. But they lost in about as many places, such as Ohio, where Frank Lausche won a Senate seat despite their support of Republican George Bender; California, where their ardent support of Democratic Senatorial nominee Richard Richards failed to stop GOP Senator Thomas Kuchel; and many other spots.

Every outsider and some insiders, familiar with organized labor operations, agree that if any true figure could be reached (it's doubtful if one ever will be) on the amount contributed to Democratic campaigns this year by labor unions, it would run into fantastic millions.

The expenditures to be reported by COPE will be a mere fraction of actual contributions. They will not show such items as the Democratic propaganda furnished by labor-sponsored radio and television broadcasts and by hundreds of union newspapers (total circulation 17 million); nor will they show the untold hours devoted to politicking by salaried union functionaries, without charge to any political group. Almost every AFL-CIO international organizer, for example, is reported to have spent the last month of the campaign on political, rather than union, work.

One effect of the surprising Eisenhower sweep may be to dim — momentarily at least — the king-making aspirations of UAW President Walter Reuther. Reuther was instrumental in winning the Democratic nomination for Stevenson, and rammed the Stevenson-Kefauver endorsement through the AFL-CIO Executive Council.

In this sense, Stevenson's abysmal loss probably will strengthen the hand of AFL-CIO President George Meany, who argued against the endorsement; he personally favored the ticket, but he thought it wrong to put the national House of Organized Labor officially in its corner. Events now have justified his contention that it stood to waste money and lose prestige by endorsing any national ticket — particularly a likely loser.

The loss also may arouse rank and file members to question the advisability and necessity of permitting union bosses like Reuther to spend so much of their dues money for such frantic but highly dubious political activity.

Letter from JAMES M. THOMSON, Former Publisher, *New Orleans Item:* "For a good many years past I have found HUMAN EVENTS to be indispensable reading for anyone who wanted to keep up with phases of matters of national and international importance. These I have not found treated so well in any other publications which have come to my attention."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

1955 Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. All Bound Volumes for years prior to 1955 have been sold.

Bound Volumes for 1956 — indexed — may now be ordered for March delivery. Regular price, $15; pre-publication price, accepted until December 31, $7.50 each.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1956.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIII, No. 45 HUMAN EVENTS November 10, 1956

Article Section

CONFESSION OF A CONSERVATIVE

By FRANK CHODOROV

I LOVE AMERICA. That trite statement calls for an explanation, simply because the explanation applies to many other patriots of my persuasion. We do not love America for what it is but for what it promised to be, in its youth, and for what is left of that promise. Our feeling is like the loyalty of a man to the memory of a woman who turned out to be less than her possibilities. Or, it is like the loyalty of an old grad to the ideals of his youth — considerably tarnished by experience, but still attractive enough to drag him to class reunions.

The present America has little claim on my affection. In fact, when I examine her with a cold eye, and without reference to what she promised to be, I see little that differentiates her from a bevy of countries spread over the globe. Were it not for that little, that remnant of her true self, I could find myself at home, all things considered, in any one of a number of countries.

Is that lukewarm patriotism? If it is, I find that many of my compatriots, if not most of them, are likewise devoted to the soul of America, not to her present vagaries. To prove the point, that most Americans are not enamored of the current America, let us try a mental experiment.

IMAGINE A Fourth of July orator expounding these views: "I love America because it takes from me one-third of all I produce. I love America because it spends even more than the amount it takes from me and makes up the difference by issuing counterfeit money. I love America because it sends my substance abroad to support tottering socialistic economies. I love America because it conscripts its youth. I love America because of its monstrous bureaucracy. I love America because it has reduced me to a number. I love America because it is my guardian and I am its ward."

Would not that speaker be rotten-egged long before he got through half his speech? Even though there is a good deal of truth in the things he said, he would not be listened to. Such things, we agree, are not to be said out loud, even as a family scandal is never mentioned at dinner table.

On the other hand, these are the sentiments that Americans always cheer: "I love America because it is the land of the free. I love America in so far as it lives up to its original charter, in which it is proclaimed that every American is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights — rights which the government must protect but may not violate. I love America because its theme song is the dignity of the individual. I love America because of its promise to let me work out my destiny with whatever gifts nature has endowed me."

The applause which greets a speech so fashioned is proof sufficient that other patriots are, like me, in love with the ideal America, not with its present shape. In fact, even those Americans who advocate and praise the un-

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1956 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mentionable practices, as outlined in the suppositious Fourth of July speech, find it necessary to tie in these practices with the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and, particularly, the Bill of Rights. They dare not tell the truth about these practices, that they are in fact steps toward socialism, that they are contrary to the spirit of America, knowing that such an admission would go against the grain. For, Americans still love the promise of its past and what remains of it. Granted that most Americans have been lured into the brothel of welfarism, unconscious of the consequences, their hearts are still conservative; they know not whither they are going.

I AM A CONSCIOUS conservative. I want to conserve the ideal of the American charter, to measure every proposal by that ideal and to reject that which leads in an opposite direction. I recognize that changing conditions demand adaptation, just as a growing boy must assume responsibilities which a child is relieved of; but I am opposed to changes that violate principles that have been tried and proven sound.

To be specific, I would conserve the principle of States' Rights, not because there is anything sacred in this original distribution of political power, but because it is an instrument for the preservation of individual freedom — the very essence of Americanism. Inherent in government, all government, is a tendency to grab power; and every addition to government power is a diminution of the area of individual action. This fact, to which all history attests, the Founding Fathers well knew, and in an effort to check that tendency, they devised the principle of States' Rights, by which the powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution were vested in the several state governments. The state governments, in turn, would be held in leash by the natural competition between them; any state that went in for the curtailment of freedom would be faced with the loss of its citizens (taxpayers) to other states. In this way, both the state and central governments could not go beyond bounds.

Nevertheless, changing conditions since 1789 call for a re-examination, not abandonment, of the principle. Among these conditions are the fast automobile and the slick roads which make it possible for criminals to escape the jurisdiction of the state in which the crime was committed to another. Thus the States' Rights principle might, if too strictly interpreted, hamper government, state or central, from fulfilling its primary function of maintaining order, of protecting the right of life and property. Therefore, the police power of government, as it applies to criminal acts, must be extended. But that does not mean that the Federal Government may send soldiers into a state to interfere with local customs or to enforce laws which are in contravention of local laws.

Another change that commends itself to a conservative is the introduction into the Constitution of an amendment that would prevent the central Government from making treaties with other governments which would in effect vitiate the principle on which our political system is founded. That principle is that all government derives its powers from the consent of the governed. If by means of treaties our Government should transfer final jurisdiction in domestic affairs to foreign establishments, over which American citizens have no control, the aforesaid principle would be wiped out. The proposed constitutional amendment would prevent that possibility, and is therefore consistent with conservatism.

In short, the conservative is bent on keeping intact and in operation such practices, customs, traditions, laws and principles which have proven themselves beneficial to the nation and consistent with its original charter, and if a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change in detail is necessary to accomplish that end he is for it. He is opposed to change only when it leads in the opposite direction, when it embarks on a course that will transform the nation into something that it was not intended to be.

THE OPPOSITE of a conservative is a radical. As the term is generally used, a radical is one who would upset the going order of things and institute an entirely different order. For instance, the Founding Fathers were radicals because they insisted on rejecting the then prevailing doctrine of sovereignty, that it resides in government, and introducing the idea that the individual is the source of sovereignty. Long before the founders came on the scene, there were radicals who fought against the doctrine of the divine right of kings. About fifty years ago, the Socialists who proposed abolishing private property and vesting property rights in the political establishment were radicals. Today, the Communists, who are the logical product of socialism, are radicals in that they would destroy every lingering vestige of individualism and institute a regime of absolutism so complete as to control even thought.

That is, radicalism is relative. It is the advocacy of change and its character is understandable only when related to the system that the contemporary crop of radicals would overturn. The radicals of one generation may be the conservatives of another. Hence, if we would seek out the radicals of our times, we must first describe the character of our times; those who would root out that character and put something else in its place are our radicals.

And what is the character of America in the middle of the twentieth century? It is socialistic. It hasn't gone all the way yet, but it has accepted and implemented so many of the socialistic tenets that we are justified in declaring socialism the going order. A people does not change its habits of thought and behavior overnight, and traditions hang on long after they have no force. The ideas of such radicals as Voltaire, Rousseau and John Locke were in the air for a good number of years before they took root and bore fruit. So, while Marxism has not yet fully replaced Americanism, it has made sufficient inroads to be given precedence.

For instance, the cardinal doctrine of socialism is the abolition of private property. The means proposed by Karl Marx to accomplish this end is the progressive income tax. This power of confiscating private property was acquired by the American Federal Government in 1913, and it was inevitable that it should be exercised in the way that Marx advocated; today that Government confiscates a third of our property, and when we realize that this was accomplished in about two generations we must admit that the socialistic ideal, 100 per cent confiscation, is not far off. Another big war or a depression should be the occasion for the total abolition of private property in America.

With this acquisition of means, the Federal Government made its way into other areas which once were considered the private province of Americans. It could not be otherwise, because the transference of property from the earner to the Government made the former a supplicant and a subject, rather than an independent citizen. And so, we have had put upon us more and more of the socialistic program; Government ownership and operation of electric power; Government intervention in enterprise; Government regulation of agriculture; Government domination of the banking system; Government insurance; Government control of commerce.

The immense economic power vested in the Federal Government has enabled it to bribe the state governments into abdication of their autonomy, so that the states have been virtually

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduced to parish status. The far-flung ventures of the Federal Government have of course necessitated the establishment of a bureaucracy of monstrous proportions, so that in effect we have a bureaucratic rather than a representative government. The Legislative branch, which was supposed to keep the Executive branch within constitutional limits, has become subservient to it; the Judicial branch can hardly be distinguished from either. In short, the centralization of political power which is essential to the socialistic program is an accomplished fact.

MORE IMPORTANT than the socialistic laws and socialistic procedures is the adjustment of the public mind to them. The people, in the main, not only accept intervention but demand more of it. Businessmen ask for subsidies, the unemployed insist that handouts are their due, the farmers cry for parity prices, the aged clamor for subsistence. The Government (meaning the bureaucracy) is not averse to the parade of tin-cup bearers at its portals, since what it drops in the cups is taken from the beggars, and all it asks in return is more power. The mark of the socialistic character of our times is the willingness of the people to give up on themselves. Self-reliance, which made America great and distinctive, is considered a decadent value.

This is the character of our times that the conservative would overturn. Hence, it is the conservative who is in fact the radical these days, and the socialists, better known as New Dealers, have a legitimate claim to the conservative title. They want to conserve the going order.

And so, though I like to call myself a conservative, logic impels me to be what I do not want to be. Reason tells me that the American ideal I am loyal to is fast being submerged by its opposite, and that if I wish to restore it to its proper place I must fight for it; I must assume the radical attitude. Things have come to such a pass that a reversion to Americanism is not to be achieved by half-way measures, by voting for tweedledee rather than tweedledum, by urging the present American strumpet to improve her virtue by a change of hats.

First and foremost, the conservative-turned-radical must advocate the repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment. A compromise will not do. It must be rooted out of the Constitution and its place left blank. Unless that is done, the principle of private property, which is the substance of individual freedom, cannot be restored. Unless that is done, the doctrine of checks and balances and the doctrine of States' Rights, the political safeguards of liberty, are dead letters, even though they remain in the Constitution.

And, in advocating the repeal of the Sixteenth Amendment, the conservative-turned-radical must point out the truth so well underlined by the Founding Fathers, that the people are on one side of the fence and the Government on the other. This is a drastic change of attitude. But, the times call for forthright thinking and drastic measures.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $20 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED